

we give the Democrats X percent of that fixed amount, maybe their argument for fairness might have some validity. But the fixed amount is the same amount they had been getting under the 107th Congress when they were in the majority, and we are saying we are going to add on the Republican side enough administrative dollars so the total percentages go up to 60, and the Democrats are objecting to that.

I ask unanimous consent for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. So this is where we are. This is not a fight over money. This is not a fight over fairness in funding. This is a deliberate, predetermined, precongressional attempt to prevent the Republicans from being successful. This is deliberate obstruction, planned and announced, at least among their own troops, prepared for and carefully scripted. For the Democratic leader, through his staff, to be able to predict in advance of the Congress meeting that a recess scheduled 3 weeks later would not occur is a clear demonstration he is prepared to obstruct every step of the way, even if it means denying the party that was chosen by the people as the majority party its proper majority status.

So let us not get carried away in percentages. Let us not get carried away in false arguments about fairness. What is on the table is an organizing resolution that deals nothing with money. What is on the table for discussion is a funding resolution that gives the Democrats every bit as much money as they had in the 107th Congress.

Simple fairness to the American people who made their choice in November demands we get on with this; that the Republicans be given the gavels; that the Congress be organized, the Senate be organized; and that we move ahead to the people's business instead of to partisan monkey business.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLARD. We are in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

#### CONTINUING OBSTRUCTIONISM

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, ordinarily I do not come to the Senate floor and involve myself in a lot of the issues that are going on at the leadership level, but I have to say I really am disappointed the leaders of the Demo-

cratic Party are continuing to obstruct the Republicans' effort to organize and to move forward with this Nation's agenda.

In the last session, we could not even pass a budget. We have appropriations bills that are waiting to be acted on as we move into this new year. My hope is we could put aside our partisan differences and move quickly forward with these pressing issues, deal with the people's business. After we finish the unfinished business of the last Congress, and after the State of the Union address, then we could go ahead and begin to move forward with the business of this new year.

Historically in the Senate, the majority party has moved ahead very quickly on the organizing resolution. It has been a standard process where two-thirds of the funding goes to the majority party and a third to the minority party.

I was interested in the reference by my colleague from Utah who mentioned there was an e-mail floating around, which he quoted, that this was actually a planned effort by the Democratic party to obstruct the agenda. I have been informed there have been previous e-mails that if the Democrat party had been in control in the Senate, they were planning to push the two-thirds/one-third breakout on funding because that has been the tradition of the Senate year after year; that is what has happened, the majority party has had the two-thirds and the minority party has been one-third.

Now we find the majority party has tried to use last year's abnormal type of session—there was nothing normal about last year's session we can use as a standard for moving forward from this point on, but the fact is historically this has been a rather standard process. I hope we can put aside this type of partisan bickering that does not have anything to do with the people's business and move forward with what historically we have done in the Senate.

Last year, Congress started with Republican control, then went back to the Democrat Party because a Republican changed parties—went from a Republican to an Independent. And then after this election, technically, we could have been back in the majority again—after the vote in Missouri. It was decided we would hold that aside and just move forward with this year's agenda.

As we enter the second week of a new year, the second week of the 108th Congress, the business of the Senate is once again seeing obstructionist politics blocking the Nation's business and our work from moving forward, getting something accomplished. I don't see any legitimate reason for this delay.

The Senate, over its many years, has abided by the clear precedent I referred to earlier, with an organizing resolution quickly agreed upon, and then we move forward with our routine business each year. Now we have the Demo-

crats wanting to change the world since they did not get their way in November.

I had one of the more contested races in the Nation, in Colorado. It is clear to me the people of Colorado are disappointed that we did not pass a budget last year; that we did not get our work done in the last Congress.

I don't think anyone wins with obstructionist politics. The big losers are the citizens of this country. We are not able to address their problems and move forward with real solutions. The people of the United States made clear whom they chose to lead the Senate. It was the same argument all over the country as in my race. Yet the minority party refuses to step aside and let the duly elected party move forward. We have a clear majority in this Congress to deal with the business of the people and the business of the country. They refuse to relinquish the power the people of the United States said they no longer wished them to hold.

We face challenging times in our Nation. Grave threats against our national security continue to damage economic confidence. Spending bills that should have been approved last year are still pending. That is right, 11 spending bills that provide funding for parks and research failed, under the leadership of the Democrats, to proceed. And they are not passing now because of the Democrats' persistence in obstructionist politics. Last year, for the first time in decades, we did not even pass a budget. Yet the Democrats still want to control.

I stand by our newly elected Majority Leader FRIST and the people of the United States. Let our work proceed. Let the will of the people stand victorious and let the continuing resolution move forward according to the clear precedent that we have in the Senate.

Newspapers across the Nation continue to report that the obstructionist politics of the Democrats have delayed the confirmation hearing of Tom Ridge, the President's choice to run the new Department of Homeland Security. My question is, Do my colleagues on the other side of the aisle truly believe the people of the United States would rather see obstruction than move forward with the Department of Homeland Security, with the effort to try to restore economic growth in this country, to finish the unfinished business we had left over from the last Congress because of obstruction politics?

The New York Times reported that until Senators adopt a so-called organizing resolution, committee chairmanships will rest with the Democrats despite the November elections that gave Republicans a 1-vote majority. The impasse creates delays in the Senate business, not only of Mr. Ridge's confirmation but also the confirmation of John Snow as Treasury Secretary, as well as consideration of the appropriations bills left over from last year.

In addition, the 11 freshman Senators cannot receive their committee assignments until the dispute is settled. Obstructionist politics of the 107th Congress continue: No committee assignments, no chairmen; newly elected Members of the Senate remain without the right to participate in discussions because of heavy obstructionism.

In my view, we must end the stalemate and get back to work. I come to the floor to reemphasize how important it is that we move forward and get the Senate's business accomplished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry: Are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

Mr. DOMENICI. Are we allowed 10 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about a situation that is evolving with reference to who is going to run the Senate and who are going to be chairmen of committees and how are we going to pay our staffs. I don't think the American people understand this debate, so we ought to explain it quite a few times.

The election occurred. There has been a lot of talk in the country about what happened. The conclusion was: Republicans won the Senate.

Now I will go back in time to the day that the distinguished Senator from Vermont formally decided to leave this side of the aisle and become independent and was ready to vote with that side of the aisle, giving them a 1-vote majority. Before that day was up, the gavels were handed to the Democrats to run the committees. So as I had been chairman of the Budget Committee, I was no more. And KENT CONRAD, who had not been chairman, was chairman. So if any meetings were called or hearings held, the agenda was prepared by him, not me.

Now we win an election, we come into session, we convene the Senate, and guess what: Democrats maintain they are still entitled to run the committees. I believe this borders on nonsense, but to the Democrats it must mean something. Perhaps they think they win elections by delaying what we do, by not letting us do work. Last time, they did that, we got nothing done, and they lost. Maybe we should do nothing and stay in this stalemate. Maybe we will win and they will lose again. But we don't think that way. We think we ought to get on with the business that is not yet done from last year.

Remember, we were not running things last year. I am not casting aspersions, but they ran the Senate and we got nothing done. As a matter of fact, we had 11 appropriations bills that we will be debating perhaps for weeks that were last year's appropri-

tions bills. They are not finished. The year started out when that gavel was switched from DOMENICI to CONRAD and he became chairman. The Democrats never produced a budget resolution last year either.

Again, some people do not want Senators from this side of the aisle to lay blame on anyone, but a budget resolution was not passed and it is supposed to be. The answer that was given was: We do not have the votes; or: It is too hard. I passed a lot of them. We did not have the votes, and they were too hard, and yet I got them done because that was my job.

I am not saying every Senator who is chairman of the Budget Committee should produce a budget. I am saying it should have been done last year. And then we probably would have completed our appropriations bills. We probably would have gotten the appropriations bills done. Now we do not have them, 11 of them, and the other side of the aisle is waiting for something to happen other than the election, which we won, to give us the gavel so we can start to work at the Senate. Frankly, I know people are probably saying: You can't be telling us the truth. This can't be the case.

It is the case. It is the case. I am chairman of the Energy Committee now. I have been told if I want to call a meeting, I am not chairman. But I am chairman. Certainly the Democrat is not chairman. They say they are, I guess, because we have not passed a resolution saying how we are going to pay the committees. Frankly, that is another issue, how much do we allot to the Democrats and how much to the Republicans to run these committees. Frankly, I didn't think, having a brand new majority leader, the first thing that would be given to him to solve is this issue. I thought we would see him down here helping us get the appropriations bills finished and get on with what we think we were asked to do by the American people in the last election.

I think they were unhappy, at least enough to swing the election, because the other side of the aisle delayed incessantly the passage of the homeland security bill—incessantly. In fact, I should have asked how many days that bill was delayed on the floor and in committee because certain Senators on that side of the aisle did not like it the way it was. That is their prerogative. They wanted to delay it. That is their prerogative. They succeeded in delaying it. But we succeeded, with the help of a Democrat Senator who suggested to his own people: Is there a higher calling than the security of our country, even if it is a special interest bill? Ask the Senator from that side of the aisle. That spread like wildfire. That is why a couple of Senators on that side of the aisle lost: Delay, delay, special interests on the homeland bill. We barely got it finished. But we didn't get appropriations finished.

Do you know what that means? If the American people understood what that

means, more telegrams and whatever they send to us would be here on the laps of the Senators than you could ever imagine. It means literally we have not funded education, roads, all of the bills on HUD, on defense, on nuclear bombs, nuclear programs—defense we have done; all the others we have not. We have not passed the annual appropriations bills. They are operating at last year's funding levels. What they got was for 1 year. We said we didn't get our work done so just operate the same way you did last year. That is why some money is not being spent on education, because it has not been appropriated. They have not been allocated the new moneys. Up and down the appropriations bills, that is the mess we are in. And we sit here and argue about how many dollars are we going to give to the staff on the Democrat side of the Energy Committee and how much to the staff of the Republicans on the Energy Committee? I cite that because I happen to chair that committee.

All I know, fellow Senators, is that in all of modern history, whichever party was ahead—by one vote or 10 votes or 12 votes or two votes—that is, however many more Senators elected on their side, they got two-thirds of the money for staff. And the side that had a minority—whether it was a three-vote minority, a six-vote minority, a 10-vote minority, which we were in sometimes—we were in an 18-vote minority sometimes—the minority got one-third, the majority got two-thirds.

This year we are one vote ahead. It seems to me the rule has been that the party that is in the majority gets two-thirds, the other one-third. I don't think the rule said: but only if you are ahead by five votes, if you have five more Senators. What if it were two? Would that be enough to apply the rule? It has been six, it has been eight. But now it is one, but one doesn't work? It's not a majority?

Because when we were even—remember, we were even at one time. We thought we should be running the Senate because the Vice President gave us an extra vote. It didn't work out that way. We had to concede. And we split the money 50-50, or at least we said we will not force a reduction.

To me, the dollars involved in that are important, but clearly not as important as doing the public's business. They are not as important as recognizing they lost and we won, and we ought to be in control. We ought to be chairmen. Clearly, our leader is the majority leader. He is not the "maybe majority leader". If you call a meeting to have a serious hearing tomorrow or the next day, whoever the Republican on that committee who has been designated by the Republicans as chairman, is chairman.

Why we sit here and let the appropriations for all of our Government languish while we argue this issue is beyond this Senator. I truly believe the Democrats are not going to win by this

tactic. I urge them to get this resolved. The American people do not want them delaying this. They want us getting on with work together. They don't want us bickering. But how can you not have an argument when the facts are what I have just said? Apparently, unless they get the same amount of money as we had agreed upon when we were not in the majority, they believe they are not going to let us run the business of the Senate.

I think it can be worked out. It should be two-thirds/one-third, just as it was through all of history, but at least we ought to work it out some way—60–40? Some way, so we can get on with our work. One hundred Senators, many new ones, are here ready to get on with their work. How surprised they must be, the new ones, ready to go to work and here we are, arguing about who is entitled to the gavel. I don't know if all those new Senators thought that was what their work was about, but here we are.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, before the Senator departs, we have had the privilege of sitting next to each other for some period of time right there in the Senate. I, of course, admire him as one of the elder statesmen and pillars of this institution. I think, if people were asked what are the hallmarks because of which we have such strong admiration for the Senator from New Mexico, it would be because of his ability to reach across the aisle and work as he has always done these many years in the Senate.

So I listened carefully to what my colleague had to say. It was not easy for you to say some of the remarks you did. You feel strongly about it, as do I. Here we are with a new Republican leader and we just want the work of the institution to go on, on behalf of the people of this Nation who entrusted to us the awesome power that resides in this Senate—the institution regarded as perhaps the most powerful legislative body, not only just here in the United States in comparison to the legislatures of our States, but, indeed, the world.

I thank my friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time controlled by the majority has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. WARNER. Would the Chair advise the Senate with regard to the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for morning business was to be equally divided. The minority party has 41 minutes left. The majority party's time has expired.

Mr. WARNER. I see. I do not at this time know—I'm not entirely sure how we say majority or minority here in this situation.

Mr. DOMENICI. That's right.

Mr. WARNER. I do not see where there is someone from the other side of the aisle seeking recognition, so the Senator from Virginia would ask for 7 minutes to proceed as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what is the time allocation? The Democrats were allotted equal time with the Republicans. What is the time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority has 40 minutes remaining. The time for the majority party has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. We were asking for a few minutes because the Senator was not here. He was going to use some time.

Mr. WARNER. Then, Mr. President, I will put again before the Chair the request on behalf of the Senator from Virginia to proceed as in morning business for, say, 6 minutes?

Mr. REID. I am happy to agree to that. Forty minutes takes us until 12:30, when the time is up.

What I ask is that the time be extended past 12:30 for the Democrats by the 5 or 6 minutes, if that is what the Senator wants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. I am sorry, I simply did not hear.

Mr. REID. I have no objection to that. I only ask the time from 12:30 to whatever time the Senator takes, 7 minutes or whatever it is, be given to the Democrats so that would be until approximately 12:40.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

I thought I would bring to this series of comments some experience I have been privileged to have in this institution. I mark a quarter of a century of service beginning this week in which I have been privileged to serve the people of Virginia and the people of the United States in this venerable institution. I just draw on some of my own experience, particularly as it relates to the Committee on Armed Services.

Currently, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, my very good friend, Mr. LEVIN, remains as chairman of the committee. We are actively carrying forward the work of the committee irrespective of some of the difficulties we are facing on the floor as it relates to other matters. But that is the way Chairman LEVIN and I have operated through our years since we came together. Both of us mark a quarter of a century of service beginning this week in the Senate.

I am very respectful of the distinguished majority leader, Senator FRIST, Senator DASCHLE, and the respective whips in their efforts to try to negotiate a resolution to this unique situation—unique in some respects but in other respects I feel that elections are held in America and the results are announced to the people of our Nation. I know of no contest going on with regard to any of the 100 Senate seats, and

most particularly those of the class who were just elected, or reelected in my case to a fifth term in the Senate. I don't know of any contest anywhere in the States in this Nation but such contest as this which most unfortunately remains here in this Chamber.

But this is the way that I have conducted myself and as others have conducted themselves in these 25 years that I have been here as it relates to the Committee on Armed Services.

I suppose if I were to say what some of the great lessons are that I have had as a Senator it would have been my service with men—and in some instances several women but most particularly the men—on the Armed Services Committee. I say women because when I was Secretary of the Navy I appeared before Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, an absolutely brilliant Senator and stalwart member of the Armed Services Committee. But Senator Stennis was chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, who followed in the tradition of Richard Russell. I really stood in awe to testify before Russell when I was Secretary of the Navy at the time I knew him in that period of time. When I joined the committee, Senator Stennis really took me under his wing and just sort of treated me almost like an adopted younger brother. It was a marvelous experience. He gave me a variety of special assignments when I first came to the Senate to serve him and the other members of the committee.

Another Senator on the committee at that time was Scoop Jackson of the State of Washington. For those few of us here in the Chamber who had the opportunity to serve with him, he touched our lives very deeply.

These men not only carefully operated under the rules of the Senate, but there was so much tradition and unwritten sort of rules of the Senate that they conveyed to us.

Following Stennis, Senators Gore and John Tower; and then my longtime valued friend, Senator Nunn—I served as ranking on the committee under Senator Nunn as I do now under Carl Levin.

But I thought I would go back and just describe how we handled the transition when Senator JEFFORDS made his decision, which decision was an incalculable blow to the Republicans who served with him in this institution because there had never really been a precedent at any time when the change of power in the Senate shifted other than by elections. It was unprecedented.

But on May 24, the declaration of independence statement was made by Senator JEFFORDS. And from May 26 to June 3, the Senate was in recess. On June 5, 2001, Senator JOHN WARNER, acting as chairman, presided over an Armed Services Committee nominating hearing. At the close of the business on June 5, the Democrats became the majority party in the Senate when Senator JEFFORDS switched formally his

party affiliation from Republican to Independent. On June 6, Senator CARL LEVIN was designated chairman of the Committee of Armed Services. On June 7, Senator LEVIN, as chairman, presided over the Armed Services Committee nominating hearing and other business of the committee.

There it is. I had waited some 20 years through this procession of seniority. Then we have an election process in our conference. I became chairman and served in that 2-year period—some 18 months, whatever it worked out to be—after 20-some-odd years of training and preparation to take on that awesome responsibility. In less than 24 hours, I stood up as I was trained as a military man and handed the gavel to Senator LEVIN, and the business of the committee went on.

That is sort of the transition, and that is the sort of spirit we have in that great committee on which I serve. We try to keep to a very minimum questions of partisanship because we have the responsibility for the men and women of the Armed Forces and, indeed, the security policies in terms of oversight of this Nation. We take that responsibility very seriously. As such, I am proud to say that I think Senator LEVIN and I have continued the traditions of those men who we deem great, great chairmen of this committee.

I hope this casts some light on the negotiations that are being undertaken on our behalf by the leadership because I certainly value it. We took our blow when Senator JEFFORDS made his switch. But I think to the man and to the woman on this side of the aisle we did it, and we did it swiftly and in recognizing that the leadership in this Nation should never be in doubt.

If I could just reminisce on one story that I remember so well. I was working on the staff of the Vice President of the United States, Richard Nixon. I was traveling with him in 1960—as we call it, an “advance man.” I had the last assignment of taking him to California that night when the nationwide election was held. The following morning I made the arrangements to convey the Vice President back to Washington. The election was still not fully decided in the minds of a number of people, primarily because of the celebrated block of votes in Chicago allegedly under the control of the then-mayor, the father of the current mayor, Richard Daley. But, in any event, we proceeded to the airport. I put the Vice President's plane on the end of the runway because we wanted to try to remove ourselves as much as possible from the clamor of the press watching the final results of that election unfold.

There was a mechanic who had come out to make certain the plane was operative before we departed. We loaded all the staff. I then escorted the Vice President and Mrs. Nixon out, and one or two of his senior associates. The mechanic had a small radio that was blaring about these 10,000 votes. I watched the Vice President at that

time instruct one of his aides to call in and say that he would not contest those votes because at no time did he feel there should ever be a doubt in the minds of the American people or in the minds of the world of the ability of the elections of this country to decide the change of power.

Right there at the end of that airstrip when that decision was made, it was conveyed back to President Eisenhower, and that was it. That night, we came back to Washington and he formally conceded that election. I think that is an interesting precedent.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the minority has until 12:40; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

### CRY UNCLE

Mr. REID. First of all, I am not going to spend a lot of time talking about the organizing resolution. I think we should follow the Durbin plan of government, which he enunciated here today—the golden rule: Do unto others. We are willing to take what we were given last time by the Republicans. And the Senate has changed; last year at this time, there were 51 Democrats; now there are 49. Today, there are 51 Republicans and 49 Democrats. We can take the same thing that we were given. That is what this debate is all about.

There were four boys in our family, and my wife and I had four children. We have kind of followed a tradition that I am sure is in a lot of families with boys. When you wrestle and do other things, one of the rules I had with my brothers and my children is, if there is a little too much wrestling, or maybe you are putting on a little too much pressure, let him cry uncle on it; then you stop.

I think the time has come with this, as reported in a number of accounts yesterday, bizarre, foolish, crazy tax plan the President has given us. I think it is time that he cry uncle because it simply won't work. Even people from his own party—U.S. Senators—are saying enough. I think what they are saying in so many words is: Please cry uncle, Mr. President.

You can look at what some journalists have had to say. David Broder said, among other things:

The dividend tax would likely deepen the growing budget deficits. The first round of Bush tax cuts will cost more than \$1.3 trillion in revenue over the next 10 years.

Kevin Phillips said, among other things:

The congressional leadership and the White House are so wedded to an economic policy keyed to helping those at the top that they lined up behind what is really a program to make stock dividends into a 10-year, \$300 billion individual income tax shelter. This isn't just trickle down economics. The benefits to the rest of the economy, even to

the stock market, are so conjectural that trickle down looks to become misting down.

That is by Kevin Phillips, a Republican.

All we need to do is look in the Washington Post, which has run a story by a man by the name of Allan Sloan, a Newsweek Wall Street reporter. He writes for Newsweek. The Washington Post ran this story. Among other things, he says there are too many leaps of faith in the Bush tax cut plan. He says that the debate is focused largely on the question of fairness and affordability.

I ask unanimous consent that the full column of Allan Sloan be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TOO MANY LEAPS OF FAITH IN BUSH TAX-CUT PLAN

(By Allan Sloan)

Do you remember those happy bygone boom days when the stock market was going to save us from a variety of ills? Rising stock prices would solve the problem of Social Security shortfalls; boost federal, state and local income tax revenue; and let us all retire young, rich and happy. It never happened, of course. And now that stocks have been in a three-year funk, we the taxpayers are being asked to bet around \$500 billion on the dubious proposition that we can jack up stock prices by changing the way we tax dividends. And that higher stock prices will bring back the good times so many of us got used to in the late '90s.

What I'm talking about, of course, is the dividend tax cut that's the heart of the proposed economic stimulus package from President Bush, our MBA-in-chief.

The debate has focused largely on questions of fairness and affordability, which are certainly important. But lost amid the din are some important unanswered questions, such as whether a \$33 billion-a-year dividend tax cut can really provide serious help for an ailing \$10 trillion economy. And whether a dividend cut whose benefit is concentrated among a small number of high-income households is a better way to jump-start the economy than House Democrats' proposals to send out millions of one-time checks in the \$300-to-\$600 range. And, finally, whether we should even be trying to stimulate the economy with tax cuts, rather than letting it seek its own path.

Bush's proposal is designed to eliminate double taxation of dividends. That's when a corporation pays taxes on its profits, then pays out after tax money as dividends to investors who pay tax on them.

Bush's plan, simple in sound-bite form but horribly complex in the real world, would make some cash dividends that companies pay tax-free. But a company's status depends on how much income tax it paid the IRS. So you wouldn't know what to count on from year to year.

The Treasury estimates that the dividend package will reduce tax revenue by \$364 billion over 11 years—my \$33 billion-a-year number. But we'd have to pay years of interest on a larger national debt, hence my \$500 billion cost estimate.

You've got to take several leaps of faith to believe a \$33 billion cut can bring back the good times. The leaps look like this: Cutting dividend taxes jacks up stock prices. Higher stock prices make capital cheaper, encouraging companies to expand, adding jobs. Combine these jobs with the good feelings